



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,760	02/20/2004	Yulun Wang	157438-0006	7411
1622 7590 06/29/2007 IRELL & MANELLA LLP 840 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE SUITE 400 NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660			EXAMINER KISWANTO, NICHOLAS	
			ART UNIT 3609	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/29/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/783,760

Applicant(s)

WANG ET AL.

Examiner

Nicholas Kiswanto

Art Unit

3609

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 7, 17, 27, 37, 47, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As to claims 7, 17, 27, 37, 47, 57, the invention claims another robot may be given priority of control over claimed robot, but disclosure only enables claimed robot to be given priority to control self.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3609

4. Claims 1 – 6, 8, 10 – 16, 18, 20 – 26, 28, 30 – 36, 38, 40 – 46, 48, 50 – 56, 58, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takashi, Kosaka (U.S. Patent #6,330,493), which shall be referred to as “Takashi” henceforth, in view of Jouppi, Scales, Mack (U.S. Patent #6,292,713), which shall be referred to as “Jouppi” henceforth.

As to claim 1, Takashi shows a robot system, comprising: a first remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24) that can access a mobile robot; and a second remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24) that includes an arbitrator that can control access to said mobile robot by said first and second remote stations (col 4, line 4 – 9). Takashi does not show a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor. Jouppi shows a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor (col 3, line 21 – 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Takashi by adding a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor in order to improve eye contact between a remote user and others interacting with the robotic device.

As to claim 2, Takashi further shows wherein said arbitrator includes a notification mechanism (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 3, Takashi further shows wherein said arbitrator includes a timeout mechanism (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

Art Unit: 3609

As to claim 4, Takashi further shows wherein said arbitrator includes a queue mechanism (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 5, Takashi further shows wherein said arbitrator includes a call back mechanism (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 6, Takashi further shows wherein said second remote station can access said mobile robot, and said first and second remote stations each have a priority and said arbitrator provides robot access to said remote station with a highest priority (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 8, Takashi further shows wherein said mobile robot operates in either an exclusive mode or a sharing mode (col 4, line 4 – 9).

As to claim 10, Takashi further shows wherein said first remote station sends a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 11, Takashi further shows a robot system, comprising:
a first remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24) that can access a mobile robot; and,
a second remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24) that includes arbitration means for controlling access to said mobile robot by said first and second remote stations

(col 4, line 4 – 9). Takashi does not show a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor. Jouppi shows a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor (col 3, line 21 – 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Takashi's invention by adding a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor in order to improve eye contact between a remote user and others interacting with the robotic device.

As to claim 12, Takashi further shows wherein said arbitrator means includes notification means for notifying said first remote station that said second remote station is requesting access to said mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 13, Takashi further shows wherein said arbitrator means includes timeout means that creates a time interval in which one of said remote stations must relinquish access to said mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 14, Takashi further shows wherein said arbitrator means includes queue means for establishing a waiting list of remote stations seeking access to said mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 15, Takashi further shows wherein said arbitrator means includes call back means for providing a message to one of said remote stations that said mobile robot can be accessed (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 16, Takashi further shows wherein said second remote station can access said mobile robot, and said first and second remote stations each have a priority and said arbitrator means provides robot access to said remote station with a highest priority (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 18, Takashi further shows wherein said mobile robot operates in either an exclusive mode or a sharing mode (col 4, line 4 – 9).

As to claim 20, Takashi further shows wherein said first remote station sends a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 21, Takashi shows a method for controlling access to a remote controlled robot (col 4, line 10 – 24), comprising: transmitting a request to access a mobile robot from a first remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24); determining whether the first remote station should have access to the mobile robot at a second remote station (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40); allowing access to the mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40). Takashi does not show transmitting video images between the robot and the first remote station. Jouppi shows transmitting video images between a robot and a first remote station (col 3, line 21 – 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

modify the invention of Takashi by adding transmitting video images between the robot and the first remote station in order to improve eye contact between the remote user and others interacting with the robotic device.

As to claim 22, Takashi further shows requesting access to the mobile robot from the second remote station and notifying the first remote station of the request (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 23, Takashi further shows wherein the second remote station creates a time interval in which the first remote station must relinquish access to the mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 24, Takashi further shows wherein the request from the second remote station is placed in a waiting list queue (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 25, Takashi further shows further comprising transmitting a call back message from the second remote station to the first remote station to indicate the granting of access to the mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 26, Takashi further shows wherein the access request includes a priority that is evaluated by the second remote station to determine access to the mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 28, Takashi further shows wherein the mobile robot operates in either an exclusive mode or a sharing mode (col 4, line 4 – 9).

As to claim 30, Takashi further shows wherein the access request is initially transmitted to the mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 31, Takashi shows a robot system, comprising: a broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 12) a mobile robot that is coupled to said broadband network, a first remote station that can access said mobile robot through said broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 24); and, a second remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24) that includes an arbitrator that can control access to said mobile robot by said first and second remote stations (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40). Takashi does not show a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor. Jouppi shows a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor (col 3, line 21 – 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Takashi by adding a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor in order to improve eye contact between the remote user and others interacting with the robotic device.

As to claim 32, Takashi further shows wherein said arbitrator includes a notification mechanism (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 33, Takashi further shows wherein said arbitrator includes a timeout mechanism (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 34, Takashi further shows wherein said arbitrator includes a queue mechanism (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 35, Takashi further shows wherein said arbitrator includes a call back mechanism (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 36, Takashi further shows wherein said second remote station can access said mobile robot, and said first and second remote stations each have a priority and said arbitrator provides robot access to said remote station with a highest priority (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 38, Takashi further shows wherein said mobile robot operates in either an exclusive mode or a sharing mode (col 4, line 4 – 9).

As to claim 40, Takashi further shows wherein said first remote station sends a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 41, Takashi shows a robot system, comprising: a broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 12); a mobile robot that is coupled to said broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 24); a first remote station that can access said mobile robot through said broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 24); and, a second remote station that includes arbitration means for controlling access to said robot by said first and second remote stations (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40). Takashi does not show a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor. Jouppi shows a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor (col 3, line 21 – 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Takashi by adding a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor in order to improve eye contact between the remote user and others interacting with the robotic device.

As to claim 42, Takashi further shows wherein said arbitrator means includes notification means for notifying said first remote station that said second remote station is requesting access to said mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 43, Takashi further shows wherein said arbitrator means includes timeout means that creates a time interval in which one of said remote stations must relinquish access to said mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 44, Takashi further shows wherein said arbitrator means includes

queue means for establishing waiting list of remote stations seeking access to said mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 45, Takashi further shows wherein said arbitrator means includes call back means for providing a message to one of said remote stations that said mobile robot can be accessed (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 46, Takashi further shows wherein said second remote station can access said mobile robot, and said first and second remote stations each have a priority and said arbitrator means provides robot access to said remote station with a highest priority (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 48, Takashi further shows wherein said mobile robot operates in either an exclusive mode or a sharing mode (col 4, line 4 – 9).

As to claim 50, Takashi further shows wherein said first remote station sends a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 51, Takashi shows a method for controlling access to a remote controlled robot (col 4, line 10 – 24), comprising: transmitting a request to access a mobile robot from a first remote station through a broadband network (col 4,

line 10 – 12); determining whether the first remote station should have access to the mobile robot at a second remote station (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40); allowing access to the mobile robot through the broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 12). Takashi does not show transmitting video images between the robot and the first remote station between the broadband network. Jouppi shows transmitting video images between the robot and the first remote station between the broadband network (col 3, line 21 – 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Takashi by adding a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor in order to improve eye contact between the remote user and others interacting with the robotic device.

As to claim 52, Takashi further shows requesting access to the mobile robot from the second remote station and notifying the first remote station of the request (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 53, Takashi further shows wherein the second remote station creates a time interval in which the first remote station must relinquish access to the mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 54, Takashi further shows wherein the request from the second remote station is placed in a waiting list queue (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 55, Takashi further shows further comprising transmitting a call back message from the second remote station to the first remote station to indicate the granting of access to the mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 56, Takashi further shows wherein the access request includes a priority that is evaluated by the second remote station to determine access to the mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

As to claim 58, Takashi further shows wherein the mobile robot operates in either an exclusive mode or a sharing mode (col 4, line 4 – 9).

As to claim 60, Takashi further shows wherein the access request is initially transmitted to the mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40).

5. Claims 9, 19, 29, 39, 49, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takashi in view of Jouppi and Zenke (U.S. Patent #6,256,556).

As to claim 9, Takashi shows a robot system, comprising: a first remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24) that can access a mobile robot; and a second remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24) that includes an arbitrator that can control access to said mobile robot by said first and second remote stations (col 4, line 4 – 9).

Takashi does not show a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor. Jouppi shows a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor (col 3, line 21 – 32).

Takashi does not show wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station. Zenke shows wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station (col 7, line 4 – 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Takashi by adding wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station in order to verify commands.

As to claim 19, Takashi further shows a robot system, comprising: a first remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24) that can access a mobile robot; and, a second remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24) that includes arbitration means for controlling access to said mobile robot by said first and second remote stations (col 4, line 4 – 9). Takashi does not show a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor. Jouppi shows a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor (col 3, line 21 – 32). Takashi does not show wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station. Zenke shows wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station (col 7, line 4 – 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the invention of Takashi by adding wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station in order to verify commands.

As to claim 29, Takashi shows a method for controlling access to a remote controlled robot (col 4, line 10 – 24), comprising: transmitting a request to access a mobile robot from a first remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24); determining whether the first remote station should have access to the mobile robot at a second remote station (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40); allowing access to the mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40). Takashi does not show transmitting video images between the robot and the first remote station. Jouppi shows transmitting video images between a robot and a first remote station (col 3, line 21 – 32). Takashi does not show wherein the access request is initially transmitted to the second remote station. Zenke shows wherein the access request is initially transmitted to the second remote station (col 7, line 4 – 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Takashi by adding wherein the access request is initially transmitted to the second remote station in order to verify commands.

As to claim 39, Takashi shows a robot system, comprising: a broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 12) a mobile robot that is coupled to said broadband network, a first remote station that can access said mobile robot through said

broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 24); and, a second remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24) that includes an arbitrator that can control access to said mobile robot by said first and second remote stations (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40). Takashi does not show a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor. Jouppi shows a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor (col 3, line 21 – 32). Takashi does not show wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for the mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station. Zenke shows wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station (col 7, line 4 – 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Takashi by adding wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station in order to verify commands.

As to claim 49, Takashi shows a robot system, comprising: a broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 12); a mobile robot that is coupled to said broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 24); a first remote station that can access said mobile robot through said broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 24); and, a second remote station that includes arbitration means for controlling access to said robot by said first and second remote stations (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40). Takashi does not show a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor. Jouppi shows a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor (col 3, line 21 – 32). Takashi does not

show wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station. Zenke shows wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station (col 7, line 4 – 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Takashi by adding wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station in order to verify commands.

As to claim 59, Takashi shows a method for controlling access to a remote controlled robot (col 4, line 10 – 24), comprising: transmitting a request to access a mobile robot from a first remote station through a broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 12); determining whether the first remote station should have access to the mobile robot at a second remote station (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40); allowing access to the mobile robot through the broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 12). Takashi does not show transmitting video images between the robot and the first remote station between the broadband network. Jouppi shows transmitting video images between the robot and the first remote station between the broadband network (col 3, line 21 – 32). Takashi does not show wherein the access request is initially transmitted to the second remote station. Zenke shows wherein the access request is initially transmitted to the second remote station (col 7, line 4 – 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 3609

to modify the invention of Takashi by adding wherein the access request is initially transmitted to the second remote station in order to verify commands.

6. Claims 7, 17, 27, 37, 47, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takashi in view of Jouppi, Zenke and Roy, et al. ("Towards Personal Service Robots for the Elderly").

As to claim 7, Takashi shows a robot system, comprising: a first remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24) that can access a mobile robot; and a second remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24) that includes an arbitrator that can control access to said mobile robot by said first and second remote stations (col 4, line 4 – 9). Takashi does not show a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor. Jouppi shows a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor (col 3, line 21 – 32). Takashi further shows wherein said second remote station can access said mobile robot, and said first and second remote stations each have a priority and said arbitrator provides robot access to said remote station with a highest priority (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40). Takashi shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a mobile robot (col 4, line 65 – col 5, line 12). Takashi does not show wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user, a doctor, caregiver, a family member, or a service user. Zenke shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user or a service user (col 6, line 11 – 32). Roy shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a

doctor (page 1, last paragraph), caregiver (page 3, second paragraph), or family member (page 3, second paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Takashi by adding wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user, a doctor, caregiver, a family member, or a service user in order to facilitate easily identifiable levels of authority.

As to claim 17, Takashi further shows a robot system, comprising: a first remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24) that can access a mobile robot; and a second remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24) that includes arbitration means for controlling access to said mobile robot by said first and second remote stations (col 4, line 4 – 9). Takashi does not show a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor. Jouppi shows a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor (col 3, line 21 – 32). Takashi further shows wherein said second remote station can access said mobile robot, and said first and second remote stations each have a priority and said arbitrator means provides robot access to said remote station with a highest priority (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40). Takashi shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a mobile robot (col 4, line 65 – col 5, line 12). Takashi does not show wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user, a doctor, caregiver, a family member, or a service user. Zenke shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user or a service user (col 6, line 11 – 32). Roy shows wherein said remote stations may be given

priority as a doctor (page 1, last paragraph), caregiver (page 3, second paragraph), or family member (page 3, second paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Takashi by adding wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user, a doctor, caregiver, a family member, or a service user in order to facilitate easily identifiable levels of authority.

As to claim 27, Takashi shows a method for controlling access to a remote controlled robot (col 4, line 10 – 24), comprising: transmitting a request to access a mobile robot from a first remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24); determining whether the first remote station should have access to the mobile robot at a second remote station (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40); allowing access to the mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40). Takashi does not show transmitting video images between the robot and the first remote station. Jouppi shows transmitting video images between a robot and a first remote station (col 3, line 21 – 32). Takashi further shows wherein the access request includes a priority that is evaluated by the second remote station to determine access to the mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40). Takashi shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a mobile robot (col 4, line 65 – col 5, line 12). Takashi does not show wherein the remote stations may be given priority as a local user, a doctor, caregiver, a family member, or a service user. Zenke shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user or a service user (col 6,

line 11 – 32). Roy shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a doctor (page 1, last paragraph), caregiver (page 3, second paragraph), or family member (page 3, second paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Takashi by adding wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user, a doctor, caregiver, a family member, or a service user in order to facilitate easily identifiable levels of authority.

As to claim 39, Takashi shows a robot system, comprising: a broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 12) a mobile robot that is coupled to said broadband network, a first remote station that can access said mobile robot through said broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 24); and, a second remote station (col 4, line 10 – 24) that includes an arbitrator that can control access to said mobile robot by said first and second remote stations (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40). Takashi does not show a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor. Jouppi shows a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor (col 3, line 21 – 32). Takashi further shows wherein said second remote station can access said mobile robot, and said first and second remote stations each have a priority and said arbitrator provides robot access to said remote station with a highest priority (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40). Takashi shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a mobile robot (col 4, line 65 – col 5, line 12). Takashi does not show wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user, a

doctor, a caregiver, a family member, or a service user. Zenke shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user or a service user (col 6, line 11 – 32). Roy shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a doctor (page 1, last paragraph), caregiver (page 3, second paragraph), or family member (page 3, second paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Takashi by adding wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user, a doctor, caregiver, a family member, or a service user in order to facilitate easily identifiable levels of authority.

As to claim 49, Takashi shows a robot system, comprising: a broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 12); a mobile robot that is coupled to said broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 24); a first remote station that can access said mobile robot through said broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 24); and, a second remote station that includes arbitration means for controlling access to said robot by said first and second remote stations (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40). Takashi does not show a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor. Jouppi shows a mobile robot that has a camera and a monitor (col 3, line 21 – 32). Takashi further shows wherein said second remote station can access said mobile robot, and said first and second remote stations each have a priority and said arbitrator means provides robot access to said remote station with a highest priority (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40). Takashi shows wherein said remote stations may be

given priority as a mobile robot (col 4, line 65 – col 5, line 12). Takashi does not show wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user, a doctor, a caregiver, a family member, or a service user. Zenke shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user or a service user (col 6, line 11 – 32). Roy shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a doctor (page 1, last paragraph), caregiver (page 3, second paragraph), or family member (page 3, second paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Takashi by adding wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user, a doctor, caregiver, a family member, or a service user in order to facilitate easily identifiable levels of authority.

As to claim 59, Takashi shows a method for controlling access to a remote controlled robot (col 4, line 10 – 24), comprising: transmitting a request to access a mobile robot from a first remote station through a broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 12); determining whether the first remote station should have access to the mobile robot at a second remote station (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40); allowing access to the mobile robot through the broadband network (col 4, line 10 – 12). Takashi does not show transmitting video images between the robot and the first remote station between the broadband network. Jouppi shows transmitting video images between the robot and the first remote station between the broadband network (col 3, line 21 – 32). Takashi further shows wherein the

access request includes a priority that is evaluated by the second remote station to determine access to the mobile robot (col 5, line 27 – col 6, line 40). Takashi shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a mobile robot (col 4, line 65 – col 5, line 12). Takashi does not show wherein the remote stations may be given priority as a local user, a doctor, a caregiver, a family member, or a service user. Zenke shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user or a service user (col 6, line 11 – 32). Roy shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a doctor (page 1, last paragraph), caregiver (page 3, second paragraph), or family member (page 3, second paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Takashi by adding wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user, a doctor, caregiver, a family member, or a service user in order to facilitate easily identifiable levels of authority.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent #6,535,793 shows a tele-operated robot that sends video signals back to user.

U.S. Patent #6,691,000 shows a tele-operated robot that sends audio signals back to user.

U.S. PGPub 2005/0065659 shows a robot controlled by a plurality of sources.

Art Unit: 3609

U.S. Patent #6,369,847 shows a hospital tele-conferencing system.


U.S. Patent #6,466,844 shows a robot controlled by a plurality of computers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Kiswanto whose telephone number is (571) 270-3269. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8AM - 5PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Smith can be reached on (571) 272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nicholas Kiswanto
6/22/2007


MATTHEW S. GART
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600